East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (EAJMR)
Vol. 4, No. 12, 2025: 6425 - 6442

Fraud Hexagon Analysis in Detecting Fraudulent Behavior: Empirical Evidence from PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja

Aliyya Puspitasari Setyo Budhi[1], RR Karlina Aprilia Kusumadewi[2*], Imam Ghozali[3]
Departement of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Diponegoro University, Tembalang, Semarang, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: RR Karlina Aprilia Kusumadewi
karlinaaprilia@lecturer.undip.ac.id

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Fraud Hexagon, Fraudulent Behavior, Power Distance, Rural Banks

Received : 15, November
Revised : 10, December
Accepted: 27, December

©2025 Budhi, Kusumadewi, Ghozali : This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional.

A B S T R A C T

This study examines the influence of the Fraud Hexagon elements pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, and collusion along with power distance on fraudulent behavior within a Rural Bank context. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to employees of PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja, resulting in 73 valid responses. The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression. The empirical findings reveal that pressure, capability, and arrogance exhibit a positive and significant effect on fraudulent behavior, while opportunity shows a significant but negative effect. while pressure and power distance show no significant effect. These findings provide theoretical contributions to fraud research and practical insights for strengthening internal controls in Rural Banks.

DOI prefix: https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v4i12.503
ISSN-E: 2828 – 1519 (Online)
https://mtiformosapublisher.org/index.php/eajmr

INTRODUCTION

Rural Banks (Bank Perkreditan Rakyat/BPR) play an essential role in supporting financial inclusion for micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) in Indonesia. However, their relatively small scale, limited internal controls, and close interpersonal relationships within the organization make Research meththem vulnerable to fraud. Reports from the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE, 2022) show that organizations worldwide lose approximately 5% of annual revenue due to fraud, while the Financial Services Authority (OJK, 2023) recorded several BPR liquidations in recent years caused by fraudulent practices. These cases demonstrate the urgency of understanding fraud determinants in Rural Banks.

Fraud theory has evolved significantly—from the Fraud Triangle (Cressey, 1953), to the Fraud Diamond (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), the Fraud Pentagon (Marks, 2012), and more recently the Fraud Hexagon (Vousinas, 2019). The Fraud Hexagon introduces collusion as an essential component, acknowledging that fraudulent behavior often involves multiple actors. Even so, fraud research in Indonesia still tends to focus on traditional models and rarely examines newer constructs such as collusion and ego/arrogance in the context of small financial institutions like BPRs.

Recent studies also show inconsistent results regarding the influence of pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, and collusion on fraudulent behavior. Some find significant positive effects, while others report insignificant or even negative relationships. These inconsistencies indicate the existence of a research gap and suggest that the Fraud Hexagon components may operate differently depending on organizational characteristics and cultural factors.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Fraud

Fraud remains one of the most critical challenges in financial institutions, including rural banks (BPRs), as it threatens organizational sustainability and public trust. Recent studies confirm that fraudulent financial reporting continues to occur across sectors and regions, requiring stronger detection and prevention mechanisms (Apriliya & Permata Sari, 2025). Rasyidah et al. (2024) also found similar issues in state- owned enterprises. In particular, the Fraud Hexagon has gained increasing attention as a comprehensive framework to capture the multifaceted drivers of fraud (Wulansari & Handayani, 2024). Susetyo et al. (2024) further highlighted the moderating role of cultural dimensions such as power distance.

To explain fraudulent behavior, several theoretical frameworks have been developed, including the Fraud Triangle (Cressey, 1953), the Fraud Diamond (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), and the Fraud Pentagon (Marks, 2012). The Fraud Hexagon (Vousinas, 2019) provides a more comprehensive framework by including collusion alongside the traditional elements of pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, and arrogance. The inclusion of cultural dimensions such as power distance (Hofstede, 2011) further strengthens the explanatory

power of fraud models, as hierarchical authority may foster dependency and reduce accountability, ultimately shaping fraudulent behavior.

Fraud Hexagon Theory

Fraudulent behavior is generally defined as intentional deception for personal or organizational gain. In Indonesia, the Fraud Hexagon framework has been widely applied to detect fraudulent financial reporting across industries, including the energy sector (Apriliya & Permata Sari, 2025) and consumer non-cyclical firms (Khotimah & Permata Sari, 2025). This model expands previous fraud theories by incorporating six factors—stimulus/pressure, capability, collusion, opportunity, rationalization, and ego/arrogance (Vousinas, 2019). Recent evidence also emphasizes the moderating role of cultural variables such as power distance, which reinforces hierarchical dependency and reduces individual accountability, thereby increasing fraud risk (Susetyo et al., 2024).

Organizational culture is another critical determinant of fraud risk. Weak ethical climates, poor governance, and insufficient internal control systems create opportunities for fraud to flourish (Nuraini, Fauziyah, & Agustin, 2025). Conversely, effective monitoring mechanisms and strong control procedures have been proven to mitigate fraud risk significantly (Wulansari & Handayani, 2024; Efendi, Sayekti, & Irmadariyani, 2024). Internal audit functions also strengthen fraud prevention by enhancing oversight and accountability (Panatap, 2024).

In the public sector, recent studies show that fraudulent financial reporting is also prevalent, and the Fraud Hexagon provides a reliable analytical tool to detect irregularities (Aviantara, 2024). This suggests that fraud is not confined to private enterprises but extends across organizational contexts. Overall, these studies affirm the relevance of the Fraud Hexagon framework in explaining fraudulent behavior across industries and sectors, while also underscoring the importance of cultural and organizational variables in shaping fraud dynamics.

The Effect of Pressure on Fraudulent Behavior

Pressure refers to external or internal demands that may compel individuals to commit fraud, such as financial obligations, family responsibilities, debt, or strict performance targets in the workplace. Vousinas (2019) highlighted that pressure often becomes the psychological driver behind fraudulent intentions, as individuals look for ways to escape stressful situations. In the context of financial institutions, particularly Rural Banks (BPRs), pressure can emerge from management's demands to meet loan disbursement targets or maintain profitability under competitive conditions. In practice, employees who are unable to handle intense pressure may view fraud as a way out, even if only temporarily. For example, personal financial burdens could lead employees to misuse funds, while organizational pressure may encourage manipulation of financial records to meet targets. The culture of collectivism in Indonesia might also play a role, where family and community obligations heighten financial pressure and push employees toward unethical choices.

Previous research presents mixed findings. Maharanti et al. (2024) found that pressure did not significantly affect fraudulent behavior, suggesting that not everyone under stress resorts to fraud. However, Setyono et al. (2023) argued that individuals facing high levels of pressure are more prone to committing fraud if opportunities exist. These studies indicate that while pressure may not always directly lead to fraud, it plays a contributing role in shaping fraudulent tendencies.

H1: Pressure has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Opportunity on Fraudulent Behavior

Opportunity is regarded as the most critical enabler of fraud. It arises when internal control systems are weak, supervision is ineffective, or monitoring is inadequate, allowing individuals to commit fraud with little fear of detection (ACFE, 2022). Vousinas (2019) emphasized that opportunity acts as the primary condition within the Fraud Hexagon model, transforming fraudulent intentions into actions. Without opportunity, other drivers such as pressure and rationalization cannot materialize into fraudulent practices. Rural Banks often face greater opportunities for fraud due to structural and resource limitations. In small institutions like BPRs, segregation of duties is minimal, technology is less sophisticated, and audit mechanisms are weaker compared to commercial banks. These weaknesses create loopholes for employees to manipulate records, misappropriate assets, or collaborate with others to commit fraud. When employees perceive that oversight is weak, the likelihood of fraudulent behavior increases significantly.

Empirical studies strongly support this link. Setyono et al. (2023) found opportunity to be a significant predictor of fraudulent reporting in Indonesian firms. Similarly, Maharanti et al. (2024) demonstrated that weak governance systems provide fertile ground for unethical actions. Although some argue that opportunity alone is insufficient without other factors such as capability and collusion, most research agrees it is a dominant influence.

H2: Opportunity has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Rationalization on Fraudulent Behavior

Rationalization is the psychological process that enables individuals to justify fraudulent actions while maintaining a positive self-image. Vousinas (2019) described rationalization as an internal dialogue that makes unethical acts appear acceptable or even necessary. In practice, employees may convince themselves that misusing company funds is only temporary, or that the organization owes them compensation. This self-justification reduces the moral barrier to committing fraud. In the context of BPRs, rationalization can be particularly strong due to close-knit work cultures and collective norms. Employees might perceive fraud as a way to help themselves or their families, or even rationalize it as protecting the bank from losses in difficult situations. This reasoning allows them to commit unethical acts without perceiving themselves as dishonest.

Empirical findings on rationalization vary. Setyono et al. (2023) showed that rationalization plays an important role in enabling fraud, while Maharanti et al. (2024) found no significant effect in certain contexts. These inconsistencies suggest that rationalization may depend on organizational culture and individual values. Nonetheless, it remains a crucial factor to consider in understanding fraudulent behavior.

H3: Rationalization has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Capability on Fraudulent Behavior

Capability refers to the skills, authority, and resources that enable individuals to exploit opportunities for fraud. Wolfe and Hermanson (2004) stressed that fraud cannot occur unless someone possesses the ability to recognize weaknesses and act on them. Vousinas (2019) added capability into the Fraud Hexagon as a determinant that transforms fraudulent intention into action. In BPRs, certain employees hold key roles with access to sensitive information, financial systems, or cash handling. Their strategic positions make them capable of executing complex fraud schemes, such as falsifying records or concealing transactions. Capability also involves confidence and resilience, as individuals must be able to manage the stress of deception while avoiding detection.

Research confirms capability's importance. Setyono et al. (2023) found that individuals with higher authority and technical skills were significantly more likely to engage in fraudulent behavior. This shows that capability amplifies the effects of other Fraud Hexagon elements, since without the necessary skills or access, fraud cannot be successfully carried out.

H4: Capability has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Arrogance on Fraudulent Behavior

Arrogance is characterized by excessive pride and a sense of superiority, where individuals believe they are immune to consequences or above organizational rules. Vousinas (2019) identified arrogance as an important component of the Fraud Hexagon, particularly in explaining fraudulent behavior by leaders and managers. Arrogant individuals often feel entitled to exploit resources and disregard controls. Within BPRs, arrogance can manifest in leaders who exploit their authority to override rules or pressure employees into unethical practices. Such behavior not only increases fraud risk but also sets negative examples, potentially normalizing fraud among subordinates. Arrogance undermines accountability and erodes the ethical climate of the organization.

Empirical evidence supports this link. Maharanti et al. (2024) found that arrogance significantly increases fraudulent behavior, while Indriaty & Thomas (2023) noted that arrogance among leaders often correlates with collusion and systemic fraud. These studies show that arrogance is not only a personal trait but also an organizational risk factor.

H5: Arrogance has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Collusion on Fraudulent Behavior

Collusion refers to the cooperation between two or more individuals to commit fraud, making detection much more difficult. Vousinas (2019) added collusion to the Fraud Hexagon model, recognizing that fraud is often not an individual act but a collective scheme. Collusion allows perpetrators to manipulate processes, falsify documents, and protect each other from exposure. In BPRs, collusion is especially dangerous because of close working relationships and hierarchical structures. Fraud may occur vertically between managers and employees or horizontally among peers. When collusion exists, even strong controls may be bypassed, as multiple actors work together to conceal fraudulent activities.

Prior studies confirm collusion's role in intensifying fraud. Indriaty & Thomas (2023) found that collusion significantly increases the complexity and impact of fraud cases, particularly in smaller institutions with limited oversight. These findings highlight that collusion is one of the most powerful drivers of fraud, as it multiplies the weaknesses of organizational systems.

H6: Collusion has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

The Effect of Power Distance on Fraudulent Behavior

Power distance describes the extent to which less powerful individuals accept and expect unequal distribution of authority (Hofstede, 2011). In high power distance organizations, employees are reluctant to question or challenge superiors, even if instructions are unethical. This cultural trait fosters fraud by discouraging transparency and whistleblowing. In the BPR context, where authority is often concentrated in a few individuals, high power distance can magnify fraud risks. Employees may feel obligated to comply with superiors' unethical decisions, or remain silent when they witness wrongdoing. This not only enables fraud but may also encourage collusion, as subordinates feel powerless to resist authority.

Empirical studies support this argument. Clugston et al. (2000) reported that high power distance reduces accountability and promotes tolerance for unethical practices. Indriaty & Thomas (2023) also observed that in hierarchical organizations, power distance reinforces collusion and protects fraudulent actors. These findings indicate that cultural dimensions such as power distance play a critical role in shaping fraudulent behavior.

H7: Power distance has a positive effect on fraudulent behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Dependent Variable

Fraudulent behavior is defined as intentional actions designed to deceive an organization for personal or collective gain, in violation of ethical and legal standards. Such behavior may take the form of asset misappropriation, financial statement manipulation, falsification of records, or collusion between employees. In Rural Banks, fraudulent behavior often manifests through embezzlement of deposits, manipulation of loan records, or abuse of authority in financial transactions.

In this study, fraudulent behavior is measured through questionnaire items adapted from prior research, capturing employees' perceptions and tendencies toward unethical practices within their organizational environment.

Independent Variable

Pressure

Pressure is the external or internal demand that motivates individuals to commit fraud. It may come from financial problems, debt, family needs, or strict performance targets within the organization. In Rural Banks, employees may feel pressured to meet loan disbursement targets or to maintain profitability, which can increase the likelihood of fraudulent actions.

Opportunity

Opportunity arises when internal control systems are weak, supervisory functions are ineffective, or monitoring is limited. It provides individuals with the perception that fraud can be committed without detection. In small-scale financial institutions such as BPRs, limited resources and less sophisticated audit mechanisms make opportunity a critical factor influencing fraud.

Rationalization

Rationalization refers to the justification individuals use to legitimize fraudulent behavior. Employees may perceive fraud as a temporary loan, compensation for being underpaid, or a necessary step to protect the organization. This psychological process reduces guilt and enables individuals to commit fraud while preserving a positive self-image.

Capability

Capability is the knowledge, authority, and technical skills that allow individuals to recognize weaknesses and exploit them. Employees who hold strategic positions, have system access, or possess specialized knowledge are more capable of executing and concealing fraud. In the Fraud Hexagon, capability transforms intention into action.

Arrogance

Arrogance describes excessive pride and the belief that one is immune to organizational rules or legal consequences. It is often associated with individuals in leadership roles who exploit their authority to override internal controls. Arrogance can undermine accountability and foster a culture where fraud becomes tolerated or normalized.

Collusion

Collusion occurs when two or more individuals collaborate to commit fraud. This cooperation makes fraudulent schemes more complex and harder to detect, as perpetrators can manipulate processes and protect one another. In the context of BPRs, collusion can occur vertically (between managers and staff) or horizontally (among peers), amplifying fraud risks.

Power Distance

In addition to the Fraud Hexagon elements, this study also examines power distance as an independent variable. Power distance reflects the extent to which inequality in authority is accepted by subordinates (Hofstede, 2011). In high power distance organizations, employees are less likely to challenge unethical instructions from superiors, thereby facilitating fraudulent behavior

Population and Sample

The population of this study includes all employees of PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja, located in Banyumas Regency, Central Java, Indonesia. The sampling technique used in this research is purposive sampling, which involves selecting respondents based on specific criteria relevant to the objectives of the study.

The population consists of employees of PT BPR Gunung Simping Artha. Sampling was carried out using purposive sampling with criteria based on job relevance and a minimum one-year working period. From 75 distributed questionnaires, 73 were returned and considered valid.

Type and Source of Data

This study employs primary data, collected directly from employees of PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja through structured questionnaires. The questionnaire was developed based on previous studies and designed using a Likert scale to measure the Fraud Hexagon elements, power distance, and fraudulent behavior.

Data collection method

Data for this study were collected using a structured questionnaire distributed in two stages. First, a pilot test was conducted with 29 respondents to examine the validity and reliability of the research instrument. The results confirmed that the questionnaire was appropriate for use in the main study.

In the second stage, the validated questionnaire was distributed to 75 employees of PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja who met the purposive sampling criteria. Of the distributed questionnaires, 73 were returned and deemed valid for further analysis, resulting in a high response rate of 97.3%.
All items in the questionnaire were measured using a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), designed to capture respondents' perceptions while minimizing neutral responses.

Data Analysis Method

SPSS Analysis

This study employed SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to perform quantitative data analysis. The software offers practical tools for managing data, conducting descriptive and inferential statistics, and generating graphical outputs.

Instrument Testing Validity Test

Validity testing was carried out using the Pearson Product Moment correlation. Each item was correlated with the total score of its variable, and the significance value (p-value) was used as the basis for assessment. Items with sig < 0.05 were considered valid, while items with sig ≥ 0.05 would be dropped. The results showed that all items met this criterion, indicating that they were valid and appropriate for further use.

Reliability Test

Reliability testing was performed using Cronbach's Alpha, which measures the internal consistency of questionnaire items. Variables with Cronbach's Alpha values greater than 0.70 were deemed reliable. The results indicated that all variables exceeded this threshold, confirming that the instrument had strong reliability.

Classical Assumption Testing

Normality was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test; multicollinearity was checked using Tolerance and VIF values (Tolerance <0.10 or VIF >10 indicates multicollinearity); heteroskedasticity was tested using the Glejser method, with significance >0.05 indicating no heteroskedasticity.

Hypothesis Testing

Multiple linear regression analysis was applied to assess the impact of Fraud Hexagon and Power Distance on Fraudulent Behavior. The regression model is specified as:

$$Y = a + \beta 1Press + \beta 2Opp + \beta 3R + \beta 4CAP + \beta 5E + \beta 6COL + \beta 7PD + e$$

where
Y represents fraudulent behavior,
X1= pressure,
X2 = opportunity,
X3 = rationalization,
X4 = capability,
X5 = arrogance,
X6 = collusion, and
X7 = power distance.

Meanwhile, α\alpha denotes the constant, β\beta represents the regression coefficients, and ε is the error term.

Determinant Coefficient (R^2)

Assesses the explanatory power of independent variables on the dependent variable.

F-Test

Evaluates the simultaneous significance of all independent variables on the dependent variable at a 5% significance level.

Descriptive Statistic

t-Test

Examines the partial significance of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable, with p-values ≤0.05 indicating significant effects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pilot Test

Validity Test

Based on the validity test results, the calculated r values for all statement items (X1, X2, X3, X4, X5, X6, X7, Y) range from 0.499 to 0.901 with significance (Sig.) values < 0.05. This indicates that each statement item has a significant correlation with its respective construct's total score. Furthermore, since all calculated r values are greater than the r table value of 0.367, it can be concluded that all items used in this study are valid. Thus, the research instrument employed demonstrates good validity, as each statement item is able to accurately measure the intended construct.

Reliability Test

The reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha demonstrated that all variables met the minimum threshold of 0.60, indicating that the measurement instruments are reliable. Specifically, the Cronbach's Alpha values for each variable are as follows: Pressure (X1) = 0.746, Opportunity (X2) = 0.713, Rationalization (X3) = 0.731, Capability (X4) = 0.856, Ego (X5) = 0.801, Collusion
(X6) = 0.764, Power Distance (X7) = 0.823, and Fraudulent Behavior (Y) = 0.854. These results confirm that all constructs in this study possess adequate internal consistency and can be considered reliable for further analysis.

Descriptive Statistic

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Variabel	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Pressure	73	13,07	2,037
Opportunity	73	11,67	1,642
Rationalization	73	14,23	1,646
Capability	73	12,51	2,729
Ego	73	12,42	1,715
Collusion	73	11,08	2,019

Power Distance	73	15,29	1,359
Fraudulent Behavior	73	11,70	1,949

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

Based on the descriptive analysis of 73 respondents, the minimum, maximum, and mean values were calculated for each research variable using a four-point Likert scale. The results show that power distance (mean = 15,29) and rationalization (mean = 14,23) had the highest averages, indicating strong respondent agreement with statements related to justification of fraud and acceptance of hierarchical authority.

Conversely, collusion (mean = 11,08) and opportunity (mean = 11,67) had the lowest averages, suggesting these factors were perceived as relatively less dominant. The standard deviation values ranged from 1,3 to 2,7, reflecting consistent and homogeneous responses across the sample.

Table 2. Total Average of Variable Indicators

Variable	Mean Total
Pressure	13,07 / 5 = 2,61
Opportunity	11,67 / 5 = 2,33
Rationalization	14,23 / 5 = 2,85
Capability	12,51 / 5 = 2,50
Ego	12,42 / 5 = 2,48
Collusion	11,08 / 5 = 2,22
Power Distance	15,29 / 6 = 2,55
Fraudulent Behavior	11,70 / 5 = 2,34

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

The descriptive analysis of total mean values highlights differences in how respondents perceived each variable. Among all factors, rationalization (mean = 2,85) obtained the highest score, suggesting that employees have a relatively strong tendency to justify or legitimize fraudulent behavior. This indicates that rationalization plays an important psychological role in shaping unethical decisions within the organization. On the other hand, collusion (mean = 2,22) recorded the lowest score, reflecting that cooperation between individuals to commit fraud was perceived as less prevalent by the respondents.

Normality Test

Table 3. One-Sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov Normality Test

	Unstandardized Residual
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) [c]	0,200[d]

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov method, as presented in the table above, show that the significance value (Sig) for the dependent variable Is 0.200 > 0.05, indicating that the data are normally distributed.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

	Collinearity Statistics	
Variabel	**Tolerance**	**VIF**
Pressure	0,571	1,752
Opportunity	0,758	1,320
Rationalization	0,734	1,362
Capability	0,469	2,133
Ego	0,516	1,939
Collusion	0,593	1,686
Power Distance	0,661	1,513

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

Based on the multicollinearity test, all variables showed Tolerance values greater than 0.10 and VIF values less than 10, indicating that no multicollinearity problems exist in the regression model. Therefore, the model is appropriate for further analysis.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Tes

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0,744	0,460
Pressure	0,067	0,947
Opportunity	-0,545	0,588
Rationalization	0,312	0,756
Capability	-0,057	0,955
Ego	1,519	0,134
Collusion	-0,162	0,872
Power Distance	-1,221	0,227

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

The heteroscedasticity test results show that all independent variables have significance values greater than 0.05, indicating no heteroscedasticity in the regression model. Thus, the model satisfies the homoscedasticity assumption and is suitable for further regression analysis.

Hypothesis Test
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

	Unstandardized Coefficient
Model	B
(Constant)	6,447
Pressure	0,310
Opportunity	-0,256
Rationalization	-0,036
Capability	0,179
Ego	0,235
Collusion	-0,040
Power Distance	0,023

Source: SPSS 27 Output, 2025

The regression model based on the analysis results is as follows:

$$\text{Fraudulent Behavior} = 6.447 + 0.310\text{Press} - 0.256\text{Opp} - 0.036\text{R} + 0.179\text{Cap} + 0.235\text{E} - 0.040\text{Col} + 0.023\text{PD}$$

Determination Coefficient Test

Table 7. Determination Coefficient Test

Model	R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*
1	,832[a]	,692	,659

Based on the table above, the coefficient of determination (R Square) of 0.692 indicates that 69.2% of the variation in fraudulent behavior can be explained by the independent variables in the model, namely pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, collusion, and power distance. This result suggests that the F-Test regression model has a relatively strong explanatory power for the dependent variable. Meanwhile, the remaining 30.8% is explained by other factors outside the model that were not included in this study, such as organizational culture, external supervision, work environment, and individual personal factors.

Table 8. F-Test

Model		F	Sig.
1	Regression	20,874	<,001[b]

Based on Table 4.20, the ANOVA (F-test) results show an F value of 20.874 with a significance level of $p < 0.001$, which is lower than the significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$. This indicates that the regression model is appropriate and statistically significant in explaining the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

t-Test

Table 9. t-Test

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2,093	0,040
Pressure	4,092	<0,001
Opportunity	-2,902	0,005
Rationalization	-0,459	0,648
Capability	2,312	0,024
Ego	2,332	0,023
Collusion	-0,541	0,591
Power Distance	0,215	0,831

Based on Table X, the t-test was conducted to examine the partial effect of each independent variable on fraudulent behavior, using a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with 65 degrees of freedom ($df = n - k - 1$, where $n = 73$ and $k = 7$).

Overall, the findings show that among the seven variables tested, pressure, capability, and arrogance positively and significantly increase fraudulent behavior, while opportunity reduces it. Meanwhile, rationalization, collusion, and power distance do not play a significant role. These results highlight the importance of focusing on both psychological and structural aspects when designing fraud prevention strategies in Rural Banks.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aimed to analyze the influence of the Fraud Hexagon elements and power distance on fraudulent behavior at PT BPR Gunung Simping Artha. The results show that pressure, capability, and arrogance significantly increase fraudulent behavior. These findings support the Fraud Hexagon theory, which states that personal pressure, the ability to exploit system weaknesses, and ego-driven attitudes can trigger unethical actions.

Interestingly, opportunity shows a significant negative effect, which contradicts the common assumption that weak controls increase fraud. This finding suggests that the internal control and supervision mechanisms in the BPR may already be strong enough to reduce employees' perceived chances of committing fraud, making opportunity function inversely in this organizational context.

Overall, the findings highlight that fraudulent behavior in BPRs is more strongly driven by individual psychological factors and authority-driven capabilities, rather than organizational culture or collaboration-based fraud mechanisms

Suggestion

Based on the limitations of this study that have been described earlier, the researcher proposes several suggestions for future research:

1. Future studies are recommended to expand the scope of industry sectors so that the findings can be more widely generalized across different organizational contexts and company structures.
2. Subsequent studies should consider adopting a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods, in order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the motivations and mechanisms underlying fraud.
3. Further development of measurement instruments that are more valid and reliable is required, particularly for new variables such as ego and collusion, so as to capture the dimensions of fraudulent behavior more accurately.
4. Companies need to pay special attention to strengthening internal control systems and fostering an integrity-based organizational culture, given that opportunity, rationalization, capability, ego, and collusion have been proven as key drivers of fraud.

FURTHER STUDY

While this approach allowed for statistical testing and generalization, it lacked the depth of a qualitative perspective that could have provided richer insights into the underlying reasons and motivations behind fraudulent behavior.

1. The study only used quantitative data through questionnaires, without a qualitative approach that could provide a deeper understanding of the reasons individuals commit fraud.
2. Technical constraints were experienced by respondents, where some had difficulty accessing the questionnaire link due to limited internet connectivity or devices, which caused delays in data collection.
3. Several variables, such as collusion and power distance, are constructs that are still relatively new in the context of fraud, so their measurement instruments may not fully represent the actual conditions.
4. The measurement scale used in the questionnaire was based on respondents' perceptions, so the results may be influenced by subjectivity and social desirability bias that cannot be completely avoided.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge PT. BPR Gunung Simping Artha Sokaraja for their support and cooperation in providing the data necessary for this research.

REFERENCES

Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2022). Report to the Nations: 2022 Global Study on Occupational Fraud and Abuse.ACFE. https://www.acfe.com/report-to-the- nations/2022

Apriliya, F., & Permata Sari, S. (2025). Deteksi kecurangan laporan keuangan dengan pendekatan Vousinas Fraud Hexagon model pada perusahaan sektor energi di Indonesia. Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan & Bisnis Syariah, 7(2), 931–944. https://doi.org/10.47467/alkharaj.v7i2.7 115

Aviantara, R. (2024). The association between Fraud Hexagon and government's fraudulent financial report. Asia Pacific Fraud Journal, 6(1), 45–58. https://www.apfjournal.or.id/index.php/ apf/article/view/192

Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P.

W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? Journal of Management, 26(1), 5–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206300026 00106

Dorminey, J., Fleming, A. S., Kranacher, M.- J., & Riley, R. A. (2012). The evolution of fraud theory. Issues in Accounting Education, 27(2), 555–579. https://doi.org/10.2308/iace-50131

Dorminey, J., Fleming, A. S., Kranacher, M.- J., & Riley, R. A. (2012). The evolution of fraud theory. Issues in Accounting Education, 27(2), 555–579. https://doi.org/10.2308/iace-50131

Efendi, H. I., Sayekti, Y., & Irmadariyani, R. (2024). Organizational culture, internal auditors, and fraud prevention with internal control and good corporate governance as intervening. Wiga: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Ekonomi, 14(1), 114–123. https://doi.org/10.30741/wiga.v14i1.103 1

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Indriaty, L., & Norman Thomas, G. N. (2023). Analysis of Hexagon Fraud Model, the S.C.C.O.R.E Model Influencing Fraudulent Financial Reporting on State-Owned Companies of Indonesia. Economics – Innovative and Economics Research Journal, 11(Special Issue 1), 73–92. https://doi.org/10.2478/eoik-2023-0060

Institut Akuntan Publik Indonesia (IAPI). (tahun). Pernyataan Standar Auditing (SA) Seksi 316: Pertimbangan atas kecurangan dalam audit laporan keuangan. IAPI. [URL SPAP/SA-316]

Khotimah, K., & Permata Sari, S. (2025). Perspektif Fraud Hexagon dalam mendeteksi kecurangan laporan keuangan pada perusahaan consumer non-cyclicals di Indonesia. Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting (COSTING), 8(1), 12–22. https://doi.org/10.31539/costing.v8i1.14 343

Maharanti, P., Yudi, Y., & Friyani, R. (2024). Determination of the Fraud Hexagon on the Tendency of Fraudulent Financial Reporting in the Provinces of Indonesia. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach Research and Science, 2(3), 1206–1221. https://doi.org/10.59653/ijmars.v2i03.94 6

Marks, J. (2012). The mind behind the Fraud Pentagon. Crowe Horwath LLP.

Nuraini, V., Fauziyah, F., & Agustin, B. H. (2025). The influence of organizational culture, whistleblowing system, and internal control system for prevention fraud. Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science, 6(5), 3949–3960. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i5.4 615

Panatap, J. (2024). The influence of organizational culture and the role of internal audit on fraud prevention. Dinasti International Journal of Economics,

Finance & Accounting, 4(6), 738–743. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v4i6.221 2

Rasyidah, R., Anwar, A., & Hamzah, H. (2024). Analysis of detecting potential

financial statement fraud in state-owned enterprises (SOEs) using the Fraud Hexagon. INVOICE: Jurnal Ilmu Akuntansi, 6(2), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.26618/inv.v6i2.15686

Setyono, D., Hariyanto, E., Wahyuni, S., & Pratama, B. C. (2023). Penggunaan Fraud Hexagon dalam Mendeteksi Kecurangan Laporan Keuangan. Owner: Riset dan Jurnal Akuntansi, 7(2), 1036–1048. https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v7i2.132 5

Vousinas, G. L (2019) Advancing theory of fraud: The SCORE model Journal of Financial Crime, 26(1), 372–381

Wulansari, R., & Handayani, R. S. (2024). Detecting financial statement fraud using Hexagon theory: The role of effective monitoring. Jurnal Proaksi, 12(2), 211–224. https://www.e-journal.umc.ac.id/index.php/JPK/article/view/6989

Wolfe, D. T., & Hermanson, D. R. (2004). The Fraud Diamond: Considering the Four Elements of Fraud. The CPA Journal.